

--42. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, soybean oil and sesame oil.--

See B20 --43. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 42.--

--44. A contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil and benzyl alcohol.--

See B20 --45. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 44.--

REMARKS

Add B20
Claims 1 through 11 are pending. Claims 2, 6 and 9 are canceled, without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter they contain. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 8 are amended to encompass infringing subject matter. Claims 12 through 45 are added to encompass further infringing subject matter. No new matter is introduced into the patent application.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version With Markings To Show Changes Made."

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 5 through 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action states:

The claimed compositions (claims 1, 5 and 8) are indefinite because the differences between "carrier" and "oil compounds or derivatives" are uncertain as claimed and as intended. For example, the same component such as benzyl alcohol I claimed as an oil component/derivative (claims 2, 6 and 9) and as a carrier (claim 3). Further, the claims 2, 6 and 9 are indefinite because it is uncertain whether "oil compounds or derivatives" which are claimed are chemically pure compounds or whether they are components/derivatives of partially purified plant oils. For example: eugenol and benzyl alcohol are obtained from many natural sources including plants and plant oils and, thus, they are "plant essential oil compounds or derivatives thereof" (see Merck Index at page 3947 and page 1162).

The claim 5 is rendered indefinite by multiple combination of phrases "with or without", "with", "or", ["and/or". Thus, it is uncertain what components are required for the claimed composition. The metes and bounds of the claim can not be determined. It is interpreted in the instant office action that the required components are rosemary oil, piperonyl butoxide and carrier.

Office Action at page 2.

*conceded
amended
March*

Applicants traverse these rejections to the extent they may be applicable to the claims as amended. In an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have deleted "or derivatives thereof" from Claims 1, 5, and 8. Further, Applicants submit that benzyl alcohol is both a carrier and a plant essential oil, and in Claims 1, 5 and 8 benzyl alcohol is a feature of the claimed invention for its properties as a plant essential oil and for its properties as carrier. As a result, Applicants submit that the claims as recited are not indefinite and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Additionally, Applicants have deleted "with and without" and from Claim 5, and thus to the extent amended submit that the metes and bounds of the claim are clearly delineated. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 through 4 and 8 through 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. as assertedly being anticipated by WO 98/30124 [IDS-3]. The Office Action States as follows.

The claims are directed to a repellent composition for controlling insects comprising rosemary oil, carrier and additional plant essential oil compounds or derivatives. Some claims are directed to a repellent composition for controlling insects comprising rosemary oil, carrier, additional plant essential oil and conventional pesticide such as pyrethrum. Some claims are further drawn to the use of carrier such as isoparaffinic hydrocarbons, to the use of additional plant essential oil compounds or derivatives such as eugenol or benzyl alcohol. Some claims are further drawn to a method for controlling insects by applying the repellent composition to a location where insect control is desired.

WO 98/30124 [IDS-3] discloses a repellent composition for controlling insects such as parasitic fleas (page 2, lines 2-5) comprising rosemary oil, additional plant essential oils, isoparaffinic hydrocarbon carrier such as wax and conventional pesticide such as pyrethrum. For example: see page 2, lines 20-32 and page 3, lines 1-4. Thus, the disclosed composition clearly anticipates the claimed composition. With regard to additional plant essential oil compounds or derivatives such as eugenol or benzyl alcohol, for example, it is noted that these components are obtained from many natural sources including plants or plant oils. The cited patent WO 98/30124 (IDS-3) also teaches the method for controlling undesirable insects by applying the repellent composition to a location where insect control is desired (page 2, line 5-8). Although the present invention appears to be intended for controlling cockroaches and ants, the cited method is considered to anticipate the presently claimed method because it is one active step method which comprises identical active step of applying identical composition with identical components to some unspecified location where insect control is desired. Thus, application of identical compositions is reasonably expected to produce substantially similar, if not identical, insect repellent effects as intended by applicants.

Office Action at pages 3 and 4.

In addition, Claims 1 through 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 95/07024 [N]. The Office Action states as follows.

The claims are directed to a repellent composition for controlling insects comprising rosemary oil, carrier, additional plant essential oil compounds or derivatives, conventional pesticide such as pyrethrum and piperonyl butoxide. Some claims are further drawn to the use of additional carrier or plant essential oil compounds or derivatives such as eugenol or benzyl alcohol. Some claims are further drawn to a method for controlling insects by applying the repellent composition to a location where insect control is desired.

WO 95/07024 [N] discloses a repellent composition for controlling insects comprising rosemary oil, carrier, additional plant essential oil compounds or derivatives, conventional pesticide such as pyrethrum and piperonyl butoxide (page 5, lines 13-22). And the cited patent also teaches a method for controlling insects by applying the repellent composition to a location or surface where insect

control is desired (page 4, lines 12-15). Thus, the claimed invention appears to be anticipated by the cited reference.

Office Action at pages 4 and 5.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above-mentioned rejections for at least the following reasons.

The initial burden of establishing a prima facie basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention under any statutory provision always rests on the Patent Office. *In re Mayne*, 104 F.3d 1339, 41 U.S.P.Q.2d 1451 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not discharged this initial burden. The factual determination of lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the identical disclosure in a single reference of each element of a claimed invention. *The Kegel Co. v. AMF Bowling*, 127 F.3d 1420, 44 USPQ2d 1123 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Gechter v. Davidson*, 116 F.3d 1454, 43 USPQ2d 1030 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the PTO is required to identify wherein a particular reference identically discloses each feature of the claimed invention. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 USPQ2d 1955 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir. 1984). There are significant differences between the presently claimed invention and the cited references.

WO 98/30124 neither anticipates nor teaches Applicants' invention as recited in the claims. WO 98/30124 merely discloses an insect repellent substrate for repelling lice and fleas comprising a fabric, and a carrier composition including a mixture of wax and an insect repellent. WO 98/30124, however, does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention; namely toxic activity against cockroaches and ants. Thus, Applicants submit that the amended claims further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference.

Moreover, to whatever extent the imposed rejections are predicated upon the doctrine of inherency, such reliance is totally misplaced. As mentioned, WO 98/30124 merely relates to an insect repellent comprising pyrethrum oil and rosemary oil against lice and fleas. This reference does not disclose compositions against cockroaches and ants. Indeed, this reference is conspicuously mute to the fundamental concept of Applicants' invention for controlling cockroaches and ants. This fundamental difference alone between the claimed invention and WO 98/30124 is sufficient to undermine the factual determination of lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. §102. *See Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565, 230 USPQ 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Furthermore, it is well settled that the doctrine of inherency requires both certainty and art recognition. *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 31 USPQ2d 167 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *Electro Medical Systems S.A. v. Cooper, Life Sciences, Inc.* 34 F.3d 1048, 32 USPQ2d 1017 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Probabilities or possibilities are not sufficient to establish inherency. *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82 (Fed. Cir. 1993). WO 98/30124 fails to satisfy the requirement for certainty coupled with art recognition. It is not apparent, and the PTO has not identified any teaching in these cited references, of the activity of the presently claimed compositions. In fact, the PTO specifically sets forth in the Office Action its presumption that compositions effective against lice and fleas translates to all species merely due to the presence of rosemary oil. There is no basis upon which to predicate the determination that the use of rosemary oil in accordance with the teachings of WO 98/30124 necessarily involves the control of cockroaches and ants. Accordingly, there is no basis upon which to invoke the doctrine of inherency. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

WO 95/07024 does not anticipate Applicants' invention as recited in the claims. At best, WO 95/07024 discloses pyrethrum, a known and conventional pesticide in a non-greasy gel formulation. WO 95/07024 merely discloses rosemary oil as a perfume to provide a "pleasant smelling gel" and to prevent stinging of insect bitten skin. This reference, however, does not disclose each and every feature of Applicants' claimed invention. WO 95/07024 neither discloses, nor suggests rosemary oil as a pesticidal agent. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

previous
to be
discussed
to
sample

THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 through 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over WO 98/30124 [IDS-3] taken with WO 95/07024 [N], US 4,759,930 [IDS-1] and the Merck Index. The Office Action states as follows.

The claims are directed to a repellent composition for controlling insects comprising rosemary oil, carrier and additional plant essential oil. Some claims are directed to a repellent composition for controlling insects comprising rosemary oil, carrier, additional plant essential oil and conventional pesticide such as pyrethrum and piperonyl butoxide. Some claims are further drawn to the use of additional plant essential oil such as peppermint oil. Some claims are further drawn to the use of carrier such as isoparaffinic hydrocarbons. Some claims are further drawn to a method for controlling cockroaches by applying the repellent composition to a location containing cockroaches.

WO 98/30124 [IDS-3] and WO 95/07024 [N] are relied upon as explained above for the disclosure of insect repellent compositions with rosemary oil, carrier, additional plant essential oils, pyrethrum and piperonyl butoxide and method for controlling undesirable insects. But the cited methods are silent about controlling particular insects such as cockroaches.

However, US 4,759,930 [IDS-1] teaches compositions with compounds derived from rosemary, pyrethrum, peppermint and other plants in a method for killing cockroaches.

In addition, Merck teaches that piperonyl butoxide is a known insecticide synergist (pages 7625-7627).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to use the repellent compositions with rosemary oil and other plant oils and/or plant derivatives as taught by the references WO 98/30124 [IDS-3] and WO 95/07024 [N] in a method for controlling insects such as cockroaches with a reasonable expectation in success

in killing cockroaches because it is known that the claimed plant or plant derivatives are effective in cockroach extermination as taught by US 4,759,930 [IDS-1]. Thus, the claimed invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary. And the incorporation of conventional solvents or carriers is considered to be within the purview of the ordinary skill practitioner in the field of insect control or extermination. The claimed subject matter fails to patentably distinguish over the state [of the] art as represented b[y] the cited references. Therefore, the claims are properly rejected under 35 USC §103.

The Office Action pages 5 and 6. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103, the PTO is required to show that an invention would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time of the claimed invention. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to an ordinary skilled artisan, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. 706.02(j).

The PTO has failed to meet its burden for *prima facie* obviousness. At the outset it is respectfully submitted that the present record is absent of any motivation to combine WO 98/30124 with WO 95/07024, US 4,759,930 [IDS-1] and the Merck Index. The Federal Circuit in *In re Dembiczak* noted that:

Measuring a claimed invention against the standard established by section 103 requires the oft-difficult but critical step of casting the mind back to the time of invention, to consider the thinking of one of ordinary skill in the art, guided only by the prior art references and the then-accepted wisdom in the field.

In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The Patent Office "cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075, 5 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Rather, in making a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Patent Office must show a teaching or motivation to combine the cited prior art references. *See Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d at 999, 50 USPQ2d at 1617. "Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight." *Id.*

"When a rejection depends on a combination of prior art references, there must be some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references." *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1456 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (citing *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686, 688, 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). "Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination." *ACS Hosp. Sys., Inc. v. Montefiore Hosp.*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Although the suggestion to combine references may flow from the nature of the problem, *see Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1630 (Fed. Cir. 1996), "[d]efining the problem in terms of its solution reveals improper hindsight in the selection of the prior art relevant to obviousness," *Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH*, 139 F.3d 877, 880, 45 USPQ2d 1977, 1981 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Therefore, "[w]hen determining the patentability of a claimed invention which combines two known elements, 'the question is whether there is something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination.'" *In*

re Beattie, 974 F.2d 1309, 1311-12, 24 USPQ2d 1040, 1042 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (quoting *Lindemann*, 730 F.2d at 1462, 221 USPQ at 488).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Patent Office has used the rejected claims as a blueprint for the deficient WO 98/30124 [IDS-3], and looked to WO 95/07024 [N], US 4,759,930 and the Merck Index for elements present in the claimed invention but missing from WO 98/30124. The Office Action does not discuss any specific evidence of motivation to combine, but only makes conclusory statements. "Broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not 'evidence.'" *Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d at 999, 50 USPQ2d at 1617. The Office Action provides no support for its broad conclusory statement that the subject matter of the rejected claims was known in the art. Nor does the Office Action provide support for its implicit finding that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the cited references. In fact, nowhere does the Office Action particularly identify any suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the cited references, let alone any cogent technical reasoning, to achieve the claimed invention. The absence of a convincing discussion of the specific sources of the motivation to combine the cited prior art references is a critical omission in the pending obviousness rejection.

Moreover, the Federal Circuit has held that "[t]he suggestion to combine may be found in explicit or implicit teachings within the references themselves, from the ordinary knowledge of those skilled in the art, or from the nature of the problem to be solved." *WMS Gaming, Inc. v. International Game Tech.*, 184 F.3d 1339, 1355, 51 USPQ2d 1385, 1397 (Fed. Cir. 1999). However, there still must be evidence that "a skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed." *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d at

1357, 47 USPQ2d at 1456; *see also In re Werner Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("[A] rejection cannot be predicated on the mere identification . . . of individual components of claimed limitations. Rather, particular findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed."). Here, there was no such evidence presented. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

CONCLUSION

Early consideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. If anything could be done to place this application in condition for allowance, e.g., by Examiner's Amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, please grant any extension of time deemed necessary for entry of this communication. Please charge any deficient fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to Deposit Account 500417.

Respectfully submitted,
McDermott, Will & Emery



Willem F. Gadiano
Registration No. 37,136

DATE: February 11, 2002

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3096
(202) 756-8351 (direct)
(202) 756-8087 (fax)

ATTACHMENT

Version With Markings To Show Changes Made

IN THE CLAIMS

1. (Amended) A contact and repellent pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, optionally with one or more plant essential oil compounds [or derivatives thereof]selected from the group consisting of eugenol, phenethyl propionate, peppermint oil and benzyl alcohol.
2. [CANCEL]
3. (Amended) The pesticidal composition of claim 1, wherein the carrier is selected from the group consisting of isoparaffinic hydrocarbons, methyl salicylate, menthyl salicylate, isopropyl alcohol, and benzyl alcohol.
4. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 1.
5. (Amended) A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier selected from the group consisting of isoparaffinic hydrocarbons, methyl salicylate, menthyl salicylate, isopropyl alcohol, and benzyl alcohol, rosemary oil, and[with and without] optionally, one or more plant essential oils, selected from a group consisting of eugenol, phenethyl propionate, peppermint oil and benzyl alcohol, with piperonyl butoxide, or sesame oil and/or soybean oil[or derivatives thereof].
6. [CANCEL]

7. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 5.

8. (Amended) A contact and repellent pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, optionally with[and without] one or more plant essential oil compounds selected from the group consisting of eugenol, phenethyl propionate, peppermint oil and benzyl alcohol[or derivatives thereof], and one or more conventional pesticides.

9. [CANCEL]

10. The pesticidal composition of claim 8, wherein the conventional pesticide is pyrethrum.

11. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 8.

12. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, sesame oil, soybean oil and optionally, one or more plant essential oils, selected from the group consisting of eugenol, phenethyl propionate, peppermint oil and benzyl alcohol.

13. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 12.

14. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary

oil, sesame oil and optionally, one or more plant essential oils, selected from the group consisting of eugenol, phenethyl propionate, peppermint oil and benzyl alcohol.

15. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 14.

16. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, soybean oil and optionally, one or more plant essential oils, selected from the group consisting of eugenol, phenethyl propionate, peppermint oil and benzyl alcohol.

17. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 16.

18. A contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil, eugenol and phenethyl propionate.

19. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 18.

20. A contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil, eugenol, phenethyl propionate and methyl salicylate.

21. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 20.

22. A contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil, eugenol, phenethyl propionate and menthyl salicylate.

23. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 22.

24. A contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, rosemary oil, peppermint oil, eugenol, phenethyl propionate and isopar M.

25. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 24.

26. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil, menthyl salicylate and soybean oil.

27. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 26.

28. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil, and soybean oil.

29. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 28.

30. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil and soybean oil.

31. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 30.

32. A contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil and L-menthyl iso-valerate.

33. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 32.

34. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil, soybean oil and L-menthyl iso-valerate.

35. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 34.

36. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil, benzyl alcohol and soybean oil.

37. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 36.

38. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil, soybean oil and sesame oil.

39. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 38.

40. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil and sesame oil.

41. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 40.

42. A synergistic contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, soybean oil and sesame oil.

43. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 42.

44. A contact pesticidal composition for the control of household pests, including cockroaches and ants, comprising, in admixture with an acceptable carrier, rosemary oil, peppermint oil and benzyl alcohol.

45. A method for controlling household pests, including cockroaches and ants, which comprises applying to the location where control is desired a pesticidally-effective amount of the composition of claim 44.